

solely benefits upper income individuals.

As we commemorate the signing of this important measure into law, I think it is appropriate that we all take time to reflect upon the history of the Medicare program and the principles upon which it was founded. Before the Medicare program, many of our elderly could not afford health care or were forced to watch their life savings dissolve under the weight of ever-increasing health care costs.

Mr. President, those involved in crafting the Medicare program recognized that providing health care to some of our Nation's most vulnerable individuals lays the foundation upon which to build a decent society. As Democrats we must continue to embrace this principle today, as we have for the past 30 years.

THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE

A TURNING POINT FOR MEDICARE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, in 1965—30 years ago this week—in Independence, MO, Medicare was signed by President Lyndon Johnson, with Harry Truman looking on.

Over the last 30 years, Medicare has become one of the largest public health insurance systems in the world, having grown from 19 million seniors at a cost of \$3 billion to 37 billion seniors costing over \$159 billion last year.

In 1995—30 years later—Medicare is at a turning point.

In fact, some would say the Medicare is under attack, because Medicare is slated for \$270 million in cuts over the next 7 years under plans which are scheduled to be enacted later this year.

This proposed 14 percent cut in Medicare spending is the largest Medicare ever proposed and makes up over 20 percent of the \$1.2 billion in cuts in the Republican resolution.

THE BENEFITS OF MEDICARE

While there are many disagreements about which direction Medicare should go in the future, there is no doubt about the benefits and achievements of the current program.

Before Medicare was enacted in 1965, health care for seniors was expensive and often unavailable, due to the lack of insurers willing to cover seniors and the fact that, even with Social Security, seniors have been one of the highest-poverty age groups in America.

Only 50 percent of seniors had health insurance, and so an illness could quickly force a senior into a charity ward or consume a lifetime of family savings.

In comparison, the benefits of the current Medicare program are clear to millions of individuals and the families of those who are enrolled; health coverage is provided for 37 million seniors—including 3.6 million Californians.

Ninety-nine percent of the elderly population is covered through Medi-

care, giving seniors the highest rate of health coverage for any age group in the United States;

The average lifespan for older Americans has increased 3 years since Medicare began, and quality of life has been improved by procedures and treatments such as hip replacements developed through Medicare.

PROBLEMS FACING MEDICARE

Nonetheless, there are some clear problems with Medicare that must be addressed, including; the anticipated bankruptcy of the Medicare Part A Hospital Trust Fund, which is projected to occur in the year 2002 at current spending rates; high annual increases in spending of 10 percent, which have helped cause the program to go from \$3 billion in 1965 to \$160 billion in 1994; fraud and abuse that eat up \$44 billion in total health care costs annually, according to a GAO report, and result in \$140 million in excess charges paid by consumers each year; the lack of potentially cost-saving managed Medicare, which enrolls only 10 percent of Medicare participants even though additional dental and prescription drug benefits are sometimes available (the rate is 25 percent in California).

In short, the current Medicare Program pays out much more in benefits than it is taking in from premiums and payroll contributions. Without reform, Medicare will continue to grow out of control. Costs for new technologies and procedures continue to increase rapidly, and about 1 million additional Medicare participants each year will add to costs.

REASONABLE MEDICARE REFORMS

To address these problems and lower Federal spending, I support a number of tough-minded Medicare reforms, including tightening controls and preventing fraud in Medicare; using successful State and Federal models such as the California Public Employee Retirement System [CalPERS] and the Federal Employee Health Benefits Plan as a basis for cooperative, market-based systems. I support asking the wealthiest Medicare recipients to pay more into the system than they do now; making managed care plans more beneficial to the Federal Government and more easily available to seniors, only 10 percent of whom are currently enrolled in HMO's.

To help solve these problems, I voted in favor of \$54 billion in Medicare cuts and reforms contained in the 1993 budget reconciliation bill, and I supported national health care reform such as the mainstream coalition proposal.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET PROPOSALS CUT MEDICARE TOO FAR, TOO FAST

However, I strongly oppose destructive Medicare reform proposals that go too far, too fast, without any certainty as to the results, including those that would force all Medicare enrollees to change doctors, give up their choice of doctors, or join HMO's involuntarily; steeply raise Medicare costs to participants, who already spend a national av-

erage of 21 percent of their incomes on health costs; rely almost entirely on appealing but untested changes to the current Medicare system, such as private vouchers and medical savings accounts; target the 3.6 million Californians who participate in Medicare for an unfair share of the deficit-reduction burden.

As a result, I voted against the Republican budget resolution, which cuts \$270 billion from the current baseline for Medicare over the next 7 years.

UNKNOWN EFFECTS OF MEDICARE CUTS

What exactly do health care cuts of this size really mean? Well, no one really knows, but health care experts tell us that the options for cuts of this size are few, and estimates by the Health Care Finance Agency, which runs these programs, have projected dramatic effects.

Under the Republican budget proposal—and the initiatives that are being considered for enactment later this fall—more will be taken out of seniors' Social Security checks, because that is where the Medicare part B premium is deducted. Medicare premiums and Social Security checks are linked together because under the integrated Social Security check-issuing system, Medicare premiums are automatically taken out of Social Security checks.

Cuts to Californians on Medicare would total over \$36 billion over the next 7 years—13 percent of the \$270 billion total cut despite the fact that California only has 9.5 percent of the total population—Health Care Finance Administration.

Costs to seniors will have to be steeply increased, even though over 80 percent of Medicare goes to seniors with less than \$25,000 in income, who already pay over 20 percent of their income for health costs.

Managed care could be implemented on a large scale without any real assurance that there will be more benefits to seniors and increased savings to the Federal Government. The current demonstration of managed Medicare has not yielded savings to the Federal Government, according to recent studies.

Popular but untested ideas such as private voucher systems and medical savings accounts, which have not been tried at anywhere near this scale, could once again allow insurance companies to discriminate against older, sicker seniors, or force families to spend their savings in order to provide care.

Relatively small-scale purchasing pools, such as the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan, which covers only 9 million people nationwide, will be expanded enormously without any clear knowledge of the potential effects on care for the elderly.

CONCLUSION

There is no argument that Medicare needs to be strengthened and improved, and I have supported reasonable Medicare reform in the past. But cutting \$270 billion out of the program and implementing reforms that have yet to be

tested is not really reform, it's dismantling the program.

The effects of cuts on this scale may not be felt immediately, and the plans for how to achieve them are certainly being kept under wraps until the last minute, but sooner or later it will be clear that cutting \$270 billion out of Medicare goes too far, too fast.

I only hope it is not too late to save the program before the American people realize it, and that 30 years from now this Congress is known for having reformed but not reduced the Medicare Program that has gotten us so far.

PROCLAMATION HONORING THE SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP OF SHERIFF JOHN T. PIERPONT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to salute a good friend whose leadership in the field of law enforcement is exemplary. John T. Pierpont is currently serving his fourth term as Sheriff of Greene County, MO, which includes my hometown of Springfield, MO. John was first elected to serve Greene County in 1981 and is overseeing an office of 140 employees in seven different divisions, all dedicated to helping and protecting the people of Greene County and Southwest Missouri. Prior to serving Greene County, John was U.S. Marshal for the Western District of Missouri for 8 years. As U.S. Marshal for the Western District, John oversaw a jurisdiction of more than 66 counties.

While successfully leading law enforcement efforts throughout southwest Missouri, John Pierpont also has been an active leader within the Missouri and national law enforcement communities. Sheriff Pierpont is a former President of the Missouri Sheriffs' Association, the Missouri Peace Officers' Association, and the Retired U.S. Marshals. John was first elected to a leadership position in the 26,000 member National Sheriffs' Association in 1989 as Sergeant-at-Arms and moved up from Seventh Vice President to the position of First Vice President which he held in 1994. I am pleased to salute John Pierpont for his June 14, 1995 election as the National President of the National Sheriffs' Association.

Through his years of selfless service and dedication to his chosen profession of law enforcement, John Pierpont has displayed principled leadership and a devotion to the principles of justice, hard work, and family. His standard of leadership is an example to his colleagues in law enforcement and all other areas of public and private service.

THE LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1060, the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, as amended last night by the compromise language developed by our distinguished colleagues, Senators MCCONNELL and LEVIN. I am pleased that the McConnell-Levin

amendment solves both of the principal problems with lobbying reform legislation that caused me to vote against it last year.

First, the McConnell-Levin amendment assures that this legislation is not directed at grassroots lobbying. Grassroots lobbyists will not be required to report their activities or disclose their contributors. Unlike last year's bill, moreover, S. 1060 does not threaten to make grass roots lobbyists divulge their entire mailing lists.

Second, the McConnell-Levin amendment removes from S. 1060 the provisions that would have created a new government agency, which would have been called the Office of Lobbying Registration and Public Disclosure. It replaces those provisions with language that establishes administrative enforcement by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Those officers, and not a new government agency, will receive the lobbying reports that will be required if S. 1060 becomes law.

Mr. President, S. 1060 represents a reasonable compromise that properly balances the first amendment rights of the people against the demand of the public for meaningful reform of the way in which Washington does business. I remain convinced that last year's bill went too far and threatened to abridge the first amendment rights of grassroots lobbyists. Moreover, last year's bill made the age-old mistake of attempting to address a problem by creating yet another new government agency. I am pleased that last year's bill was defeated and that, this year, the opposing sides in that battle have come together to produce this bill.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Senator MCCONNELL, for his able leadership with respect to this bill. He has done an outstanding job in achieving the imminent overwhelming approval of the Senate for this bill.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and doc-

uments, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1226. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the financial audit of the Resolution Trust Corporation for fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1227. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to final decisions and actions in response to the recommendations of the Inspector General; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1228. A communication from the President of the Federal Financing Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 1994 management report of the FFB; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1229. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1230. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-77, enacted by the Council on June 19, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1231. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-76, enacted by the Council on June 19, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1232. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-67, enacted by the Council on June 19, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1233. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-68, enacted by the Council on June 19, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1234. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-69, enacted by the Council on June 19, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1235. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-71, enacted by the Council on June 19, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1236. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-70, enacted by the Council on June 19, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1237. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-72, enacted by the Council on June 19, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1238. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-73, enacted by the Council on June 19, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1239. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 11-74, enacted by the Council on June 19, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1240. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Farm